REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request consideration of the subject application as amended herein. This Amendment is submitted in response to the Non-Final Office Action mailed November 9, 2009. Claims 1-6 and 8-32 stand rejected. In this Amendment, claims 1, 20, 31, and 32 have been amended. It is respectfully submitted that the amendments do not add new matter because support for the amendments may be found at least in paragraphs 79, 88, and 117 of the specification as originally filed. No claims have been canceled. Therefore, claims 1-6 and 8-32 are presented for examination. Applicants reserve all rights with respect to the applicability of the Doctrine of Equivalents.

Summary of Interview

Applicants thank the Examiner for granting an Examiner Interview on January 13, 2010. In the Examiner Interview, the claims were discussed in light of the §103 rejection with regard to reference U.S. Patent No. 5,835,722 to Bradshaw, U.S. Patent No. 6,233,618 to Shannon, and U.S. Patent No. 6,507,846 to Consens. In particular, possible clarifying amendments were discussed, which are reflected in the current claim amendments.

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-3, 6, 8-15, 20-21, 24-26 and 31-32

Claims 1-3, 6, 8-15, 20-21, 24-26 and 31-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bradshaw (U.S. Patent No. 5,835,722, hereinafter

"Bradshaw"), in view of Shannon (U.S. Patent No. 6,233,618, hereinafter "Shannon") and further in view of Consens (U.S. Patent No. 6,507,846).

Bradshaw is directed to preventing future access to vulgar Internet sites and future creation of vulgar documents. Specifically, Bradshaw describes blocking attempts to access and transmit vulgar and pornographic material.

Shannon describes a client that sends a packet, carrying a request for a web page, to a server. A network device that acts as a gateway between the client and the server receives the packet from the client before it is delivered to the server. The network device determines whether the client is trying to access a restricted web page by comparing the destination URL and the destination IP address in the packet against a database within the network device containing a list of URLs and IP addresses for restricted web pages.

Consens discloses a method of indexing relational databases to permit efficient relational queries on databases. Tokens are generated identifying the table and column of the subset of data in the relational view of source data. A table from a relational database is converted into a token stream by requesting all the tuples of the tables in the data sources. The values from the table are broken up into tokens, which create a token stream. The token stream includes the data from the table itself.

Claim 1, as amended, recites in part receiving, by the client device from a server, an abstract data structure derived from data elements of pre-selected data to be protected, the pre-selected data being stored on the server, the abstract data structure containing positional information identifying a position in the pre-selected data for each data element of the pre-selected data, wherein the abstract data structure does not contain the data elements of the pre-selected data.

Applicants' Specification describes some embodiments of the invention as follows. The Specification states "the PMS creates an index from the database that contains no copies of the database data, or contains only encrypted or hashed copies of database data." (Specification, page 25, paragraph 79).

The Examiner acknowledges that Bradshaw does not teach or suggest receiving an abstract data structure derived from data elements of pre-selected data to be protected. Because Bradshaw does not teach or suggest the abstract data structure as claimed, Bradshaw cannot be teach or suggest that the abstract data structure does not contain the data elements of the pre-selected data as claimed.

Shannon does not teach or suggest the elements which are missing from Bradshaw. Shannon fails to teach or suggest the abstract data structure as claimed because Shannon identifies resource identification data specifying the data requested by the client. In contrast, amended claim 1 does not contain the data elements of the pre-selected data.

Consens further fails to teach or suggest the elements which are missing from Bradshaw and Shannon. Consens's data structure includes the data elements of the pre-selected data. In particular, Table 1 in Consens contains:

A	B
Joe Smith	abc cde
Sara Smith	abc xyz

Consens converts Table 1 into the relational token string of "@R.A Joe Smith @R.B abc cde @R.A Sara Smith @R.B abc xyz". Consens's table cannot be considered equivalent to the abstract data structure as claimed because Consens's table contains the database data, as opposed to not containing the data elements of the

pre-selected data as claimed. Moreover, Consens's relational token string cannot be considered equivalent to the abstract data structure as claimed because Consens's string includes data elements of database data, rather than not containing the data elements of the pre-selected data as claimed.

Hence, Consens is missing the same elements as Bradshaw and Shannon. Accordingly, the combination of the cited references does not teach or suggest the elements of the present invention that are included in the language of claim 1 as amended. Similar language is also included in independent claims 20 and 31. Accordingly, the present invention as claimed in independent claims 1, 20 and 31 and their corresponding dependent claims is patentable over the cited references.

Independent claim 32, as amended, recites in part:

> receiving an abstract data structure derived from data elements of pre-selected data to be protected, the pre-selected data being stored on a server;
>
> storing the abstract data structure in memory of the client device, the stored abstract data structure not containing the data elements of the pre-selected data to be protected.

As noted above, the Examiner acknowledges that Bradshaw does not teach or suggest receiving an abstract data structure derived from data elements of pre-selected data to be protected. Much less does Bradshaw teach or suggest storing the abstract data structure in memory of the client, the stored abstract data structure not containing the data elements of the pre-selected data to be protected.

Shannon does not teach or suggest the features lacking in Bradshaw. As noted above, Shannon fails to teach or suggest the abstract data structure as claimed because Shannon identifies resource identification data specifying the data requested by the client. In contrast, amended claim 32 does not contain the data elements of the

pre-selected data to be protected.

As noted above, Consens also fails to teach or suggest the abstract data structure as claimed because Consens includes data elements of the pre-selected data to be protected in the tables as well as the created token strings, rather than not containing the data elements of the pre-selected data as claimed.

Therefore, the combination of the cited references does not teach or suggest the elements of the present invention that are taught in claim 32. Accordingly, the present invention as claimed in independent claim 32 is patentable over the cited references.

Claims 4, 16-19, 22 and 27-30

Claims 4, 16-19, 22 and 27-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bradshaw, in view of Shannon, in view of Consens, and further in view of Brandt (U.S. Patent No. 5,892,905, hereinafter "Brandt") filed December 23, 1996. Claims 4 and 16-19 are dependent on claim 1. Therefore, claims 4 and 16-19 include the same elements as claims 1. Claims 22 and 27-30 are dependent on claim 20. Therefore, claims 22 and 27-30 include the same elements as claims 20. As noted above, the combination of Bradshaw, Shannon, and Consens do not teach or suggest the elements recited in claims 1 and 20. These features are also missing from Brandt. Brandt provides a common user interface for a software application accessed via the Internet. A software application runs on a web server computer system. However, Brandt does not teach or suggest the elements recited in claim 1. Thus, claims 4, 16-19, 22 and 27-30 are patentable for at least the same reasons as given above with respect to claims 1 and 20.

Claims 5 and 23

Claims 5 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bradshaw, in view of Shannon, further in view of Consens further in view of Brandt, and further in view of Dascalu (US Patent No. 5,958,015) filed October 29, 1996. Claim 5 is dependent on claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1. Therefore, claim 5 includes the same elements as claim 1. Claim 23 is dependent on claim 20. Therefore, claim 23 includes the same elements as claim 20. As noted above, the combination of Bradshaw, Shannon, Consens, and Brandt do not teach or suggest the elements recited in claims 1 and 20. These features are also missing from Dascalu. Dascalu teaches a session wall that listens to communications sent over the network. Dascalu listens to communication messages exchanged between a client and a server and determines whether the messages can be permitted based on stored access rules. However, Dascalu does not teach or suggest the elements recited in claims 1 and 20. Thus, claims 5 and 23 are patentable for at least the same reasons as given above with respect to claims 1 and 20.

Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Deposit Account Authorization

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then Applicant hereby requests such extension.

If the Examiner determines the prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (408) 720-8300.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: February 9, 2010

Marina Portnova
Reg. No. 45,750

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300